



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/528,284

08/29/2005

Walter Keller

0740-70

6605

616

7590

04/17/2008

THE MAXHAM FIRM

9330 SCRANTON ROAD, SUITE 350

SAN DIEGO, CA 92121

EXAMINER

NOORISTANY, SULAIMAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2146

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/17/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/528,284	Applicant(s) KELLER, WALTER	
	Examiner SULAIMAN NOORISTANY	Art Unit 2146	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 9-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/18/2005, 12/08/2005</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

Detailed Action

This Office Action is response to the application (10/528284) filed on 29 August 2005.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 1/18/08 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9-20, 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Fleming**, US Patent No. **6,249,805** in view of **Sundsted** U.S. Patent No. **US 5,999,967**.

Regarding claim 9, Fleming teaches wherein a method to automatically handle undesired electronic mail (e-mail) in communication networks at the receiver, the method comprising:

automatically comparing the sender address accompanying an incoming e-mail to an electronically accessed list of authorized sender addresses assigned to the receiver **(Fig. 1, unit 106 – authorization component)**; and then

storing the e-mail in a mailbox MB of the recipient **(Fig. 2, unit 205 – store selected Email in inbox folder)**, wherein the only e-mails transferred to the receiver's mailbox are those that had clearly been sent by authorized senders **(Fig. 2, unit 204 – retrieved ID in authorized list)**.

With respect to claim 9, Fleming teaches the invention set forth above except for the claimed “*in combination with:*

performing an analysis to see if there is serial, incremental user identification occurring so that conclusions can be drawn concerning automatic attempts at breaking into the e-mail system.”

Sundsted teaches that is well known to utilize filtering the receiving emails in combination with performing an analysis to see if there is serial, incremental user identification occurring so that conclusions can be drawn concerning automatic attempts at breaking into the e-mail system **(Fig. 3A, unit 23 – Analysis Module)**.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Fleming's invention by adding analyzing module which reads the serial number from Serial Number Field. It then checks History Log to see if this electronic stamp has been received before. If the electronic stamp is found in History Log, this is a good indication that the electronic mail has been delivered multiple times, either due to a fault in the electronic mail system or due to malicious intent. In

either case, the electronic stamp and the associated electronic mail should be rejected, as taught by Sundsted.

Regarding claim 10, Fleming and Sundsted together taught the method according as in claim 9 above. Fleming further teaches wherein there are two logically or physically, or both, separate mailboxes, said mailbox MB (**inbox folder**) and a junk mailbox JMB (**Junk Mail folder**), wherein the e-mail server sends to the JMB mailbox all incoming e-mails that indeed have the subscriber's correct recipient address but are not contained in the sender list on the receiving side (**If the retrieved ID does not match, than the authorization component stores the intercepted electronic mail message in a pre-designated location, such as a Junk Mail folder – Col. 4, lines 24-27**), thus making them available for further processing selectively by the internet service provider, the administrative authorities, and by the recipient (**periodically, the user can view the Junk mail folder to delete or read (means further processing) the electronic messages that we designed as junk – Col. 4, lines 34-36**).

Regarding claims 11 and 12, Fleming and Sundsted together taught the method according as in claim 9 above. Fleming further teaches wherein the incoming e-mails are selectively put through an automatic handling and analysis process (**The authorization component intercepts electronic mail messages that are sent to a user before they are placed in the user's Inbox folder—Col. 4, lines 15-17**), which can be selectively configured by the recipient and by the ISP (**forwards the electronic**

mail message to the recipient via a communications mechanism such as a local area network or the Internet – Col. 1, lines 18-20), selectively in the e-mail server, in a comparison device (**various computer systems – Col. 1, lines 35**), and in at least one of the mailboxes (**Inbox folder or Junk Mail folder**), said process initiated and configured either on a case-by-case basis or permanently (**Fig. 3**).

Sundsted further teaches wherein the incoming e-mails are selectively put through an automatic handling and analysis process, which can be selectively configured by the recipient and by the ISP, selectively in the e-mail server, in a comparison device, and in at least one of the mailboxes, said process initiated and configured either on a case-by-case basis or permanently (**Procmail – Col. 1, lines 30-41**).

Regarding claims 13-16, Fleming and Sundsted together taught the method according as in claim 9 above. Fleming further teaches wherein all executable programs sent as attachments to e-mails are automatically separated in the JMB (**a user can indicate that all email messages received from a certain sender can automatically be stored in a designed folder (e. i.; Junk Mail folder), ... Col. 3, lines 26-28**).

Regarding claims 17- 20, Fleming and Sundsted together taught the method according as in claim 9 above. Fleming further teaches wherein if an undesired e-mail is received, discontinuation requests, or cease and desist demands, can be generated automatically and delivered to the sender (**Whenever a recipient does not want to be included on**

a mailing list, the recipient can notify the de-spamming computer system, which will add the recipient's electronic mail address to the list of electronic mail addresses that are not to receive junk mail – Col. 3, lines 17-21).

Regarding claims 25-28, Fleming and Sundsted together taught the method according as in claim 9 above. Fleming further teaches wherein the contents of the JMB can be cyclically deleted at specific time intervals **(Periodically, the user can view the Junk Mail folder to delete or read the electronic mail messages that were designated as junk – Col. 4, lines 33-36).**

Claims 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Fleming**. US Patent No. **6,249,805** in view of **Sundsted** U.S. Patent No. **US 5,999,967** further in view of **Lalonde** US Patent No. **US 7,072,944**.

Regarding claims 21-24, Fleming and Sundsted together taught the method according as in claim 9 above. However Fleming and Sundsted are silent in terms of "*wherein virus checks of the e-mail can be carried out selectively at an established time of day or each time a message arrives.*"

Lalonde teaches that it is well known to have "wherein virus checks of the e-mail can be carried out selectively at an established time of day or each time a message arrives" **(Fig. 9, unit 174 – virus check).**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Fleming's and Sundsted's invention by utilizing virus system in which it solves the major problems of ensuring that the emails are handled in an efficient and timely manner in the email engine. The application is typically provided on a client machine (e.g. PCs) and communicates with a mail server so that, when the client machine receives email from the mail server, the client plug-in authenticates the email as described herein. Thus, each time the virus protection application checks an email for a virus, it also authenticates the email to obtain an authentication indicator which informs a user of the likelihood of the email being spoofed (as taught by Lalonde).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 9-28 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new ground(s) rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sulaiman Nooristany whose telephone number is (571) 270-1929. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9 to 5. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeff Pwu, can be reached on (571) 272-6798. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR: Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197.

Sulaiman Nooristany 04/11/2008

/Jeffrey Pwu/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2146